

**Statement on James D. Wolfensohn's Decision To Serve a Second Term as President of the World Bank**

*September 28, 1999*

I am very pleased that Jim Wolfensohn will serve a second term as World Bank president. During a precarious period for the world economy, Jim has shown a true passion for helping people who live in the poorest countries of the world weather the financial crisis and making sure they have a voice in decisions that affect them.

Jim's hands-on style has served the World Bank well. He has traveled to more than 100 countries to see for himself what is working and what needs to be done to create jobs, improve education, fight hunger, and attack diseases like AIDS. And he has shown an abiding commitment to reinventing the World Bank—to make sure that it is equipped to meet the challenges of globalization. In addition to improving governance and broadening participation, he has been working hard to improve transparency and clamp down on corruption.

His leadership, imagination, and deep moral commitment make him an outstanding choice for the World Bank as it enters the next century.

**Statement on Education Appropriations Legislation**

*September 28, 1999*

Today the Senate Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations committee passed a spending bill that fails to invest in key initiatives to raise student achievement. While its funding levels are better than those of the House version, the Senate bill still falls short of what we need to strengthen America's schools. It does not guarantee a single dollar for our efforts to hire quality teachers and reduce class size in the early grades. It cuts funding for education technology and underfunds such efforts as GEAR UP and after-school programs. And it does not provide funding to turn around failing schools.

To develop world-class schools, we need to invest more and demand more in return.

We need accountability from our schools—and from our Congress, too.

In addition, the reduction in funding for the social services block grant could severely undermine State and local efforts to provide child care, child welfare programs, and services for the disabled. By failing to fund the family caregiver initiative, the bill also withholds critical aid to families caring for elderly or ill relatives. The legislation also short-changes public health priorities in preventive and mental health and underfunds programs that would give millions of Americans improved access to health care.

If this bill were to come to me in its current form, I would have to veto it. I believe, however, that we can avoid this course. I sent the Congress a budget for the programs covered by this bill that provided for essential investments in America's needs, and that was fully paid for. I look forward to working with Congress on a bipartisan basis to ensure that this bill strengthens public education and other important national priorities.

**Statement on Returning Without Approval to the House of Representatives the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000"**

*September 28, 1999*

H.R. 2587, the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000," approves local funding and provides for targeted Federal funding for the District of Columbia that we all support. The bill includes essential funding for District Courts and Corrections and the DC Offender Supervision Agency and makes some progress towards providing requested funds for a new tuition assistance program for District of Columbia residents.

However, I have decided to veto this bill because Congress has added a number of unacceptable riders that prevent local residents from making their own decisions about local matters. Congress has interfered in local decisions in this bill in a way that it would not have done to any other local jurisdiction in the country. For example, this bill bars the District from spending its own funds to seek voting rights for the citizens of the District of Columbia. Congress should not impose

such conditions on the District of Columbia. And it is wrong for some in Congress to threaten to cut funding that would fight crime, expand educational opportunity by providing tuition assistance, and improve children's health simply because they are unwilling to let the people of the District of Columbia make local decisions about local matters, as they should under home rule.

**Message to the House of Representatives Returning Without Approval the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000"**

*September 28, 1999*

*To the House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval, H.R. 2587, the "District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000." Although the bill provides important funding for the District of Columbia, I am vetoing this bill because it includes a number of highly objectionable provisions that are unwarranted intrusions into local citizens' decisions about local matters.

I commend the Congress for developing a bill that includes requested funding for the District of Columbia. The bill includes essential funding for District Courts and Corrections and the D.C. Offender Supervision Agency and goes a long way toward providing requested funds for a new tuition assistance program for District of Columbia residents. I appreciate the additional funding included in the bill to promote the adoption of children in the District's foster care system, to support the Children's National Medical Center, to assist the Metropolitan Police Department in eliminating open-air drug trafficking in the District, and for drug testing and treatment, among other programs.

However, I am disappointed that the Congress has added to the bill a number of highly objectionable provisions that would interfere with local decisions about local matters. Were it not for these provisions, I would sign the bill into law. Many of the Members who voted for this legislation represent States and localities that do not impose similar restrictions on their own citizens. I urge the Congress to remove the following provisions ex-

pediciously to prevent the interruption of important funding for the District of Columbia:

- *Voting Representation.* H.R. 2587 would prohibit not only the use of Federal, but also District funds to provide assistance for petition drives or civil action that seek to obtain voting representation in the Congress for residents of the District of Columbia.
- *Limit on Access to Representation in Special Education Cases.* The bill would cap the award of plaintiffs' attorneys' fees in cases brought by parents of District schoolchildren against the District of Columbia Public Schools under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In the long run, this provision would likely limit the access of the District's poor families to quality legal representation, thus impairing their due process protections provided by the IDEA.
- *Abortion.* The bill would prohibit the use of not only Federal, but also District funds to pay for abortions except in those cases where the life of the mother is endangered or in situations involving rape or incest.
- *Domestic Partners Act.* The bill would prohibit the use of not only Federal, but also District funds to implement or enforce the Health Care Benefits Expansion Act of 1992.
- *Needle Exchange Programs.* The bill contains a ban that would seriously disrupt current AIDS/HIV prevention efforts by prohibiting the use of Federal and local funds for needle exchange programs. H.R. 2587 denies not only Federal, but also District funding to any public or private agency, including providers of HIV/AIDS-related services, in the District of Columbia that uses the public or private agency's own funds for needle exchange programs, undermining the principle of home rule in the District.
- *Controlled Substances.* The bill would prohibit the District from legislating with respect to certain controlled substances, in a manner that all States are free to do.